Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

pressing or dwarfing influence on the brain, or anything to give encouragement to the practice lately adopted in some instances of removal of a part of the bony case, with the idea of affording more space and freedom for the growth of the brain. In these, as in other cases of man and the lower animals, the brain-growth is the determining factor, and the skull grows upon and accommodates itself to the brain, whether the latter be large or small." (Nature, 1895.)

Zoological News, Birds—During the recent visit of Messrs. Brewster and Chapman to the island of Trinidad, the observations of Mr. Chapman on the song habit of the Rachette Hummingbird (*Pygmornis longuemareus*) were confirmed by the discovery of a locality to which the birds evidently came to sing. This resort was frequented also by *Phaethornis guyi* for the same purpose. The latter, while singing, spreads the tail feathers to the fullest extent, pointing them forward over the back until the tips of the long central feathers nearly touch the back of the head. The effect is most striking, the birds suggesting diminutive turkey-cocks. All the specimens killed at these haunts were males. (The Auk, XII, 1895).

The family name of Macropterygidæ is proposed for the Tree-Swifts of Malaysia, by Mr. F. A. Lucas, instead of Dendrochelidonidae, which is preoccupied. To the differential characters described in a previous paper, the author adds the following three important ones:

	Micropodidae.	*Macropterygidae.*
Hypsotarsus,	simply grooved,	with an tendinal foramen.
Shoulder-muscles,	strictly Cypseline,	Passerine.
Deep Plantars,	strictly Cypseline,	characteristic.

The author states that the differences between the Macropterygidae and other Swifts are as great as those existing between any two families of Passerines with which he is acquainted. (The Auk, Vol. XII, 1895).

ENTOMOLOGY.[1]

Chordeumidæ or Craspedosomatidæ ?—This family of Diplopoda has been classified by different authors under the Iulidæ, Polydesmidæ and Lysiopetalidæ,[2] but if we acknowledge its distinctness a choice is still necessary between the names mentioned in the heading.

---

[1] Edited by Clarence M. Weed, New Hampshire College, Durham, N. H.

The weight of more recent usage is clearly on the side of " *Chordeumidæ*," indeed this name seems to have been almost exclusively employed since it was taken up by Latzel in his great work on the Austrian Myriapoda (1884), after having been entirely disregarded since its publication by C. L. Koch (1847).[3] The alternative is thus between ten years of usage or five years of priority.[4] For those of us who may have used " *Chordeumidæ* " on the supposition that Latzel must have had some good reason for neglecting an earlier name, it may save the trouble of reference to a comparatively rare book to state that in Gray's arrangement "Fam. 2 *Craspedosomidæ*" includes the four genera Craspedosoma Leach, Cylindrosoma Gray, Reasia Gray, and Cambala Gray, in the order named. Evidently the author did not base his family on characters now recognized as important, but no more did Koch, who included in " *Chordeumidæ*" Campodes and Callipus, members respectively of the Iulidæ and Lysiopetalidæ.

It would seem that there was less warrant for Latzel's course from the fact that Humbert and Saussure had recognized and described[5] the family " *Craspedosomidæ*," though still including the Lysiopetalidæ as one of two tribes or sub-families; indeed, it is entirely possible that the preference for " *Chordeumidæ* " was merely on the ground of brevity. There is, at least, ample justification for such a supposition in the fact that Latzel had previously changed the names of the families Pauropodidæ and Eurypauropodidæ, alleging as a reason the similarity of the former with the ordinal name Pauropoda, and the "horrible difficulty of pronunciation" of the latter. Priority aside, these reasons seem hardly sufficient to justify such family names as "*Pauropoda agilia* " and " *Pauropoda tardigrada*," which Latzel offers as substitutes. But even if the improvement had been more marked there must still be grave doubts of the advisability of changing family names whenever more brief or euphonious substitutes are offered. True, the winding polysyllables seem a useless infliction, and doubtless frighten many short-breathed people away from scientific study; but if there had been no dodging on "*Craspedosomatidacæ*," it might have stood as a warning which should have saved us such names as Paradoxosomatidæ, Archispirostreptus, and Pseudonannolenidæ. These are longer than the pre-Linnean descriptions, and may further endanger the popularity of the binomial system, already threatened in other ways.

---

[2] Iulidæ: Leach, Berlese.
Polydesmidæ; Newport, Gervais, Porat, Meinert.
Lysiopetalidæ: Wood, Cope, Harger, Ryder, Packard.

[3] System der Myriapoden, pp. 49 and 119.

[4] The family "Craspedosomadæ" was published by J. E. Gray in the article on Myriapoda by T. Rymer Jones, in Todd's Cyc. Anat. and Physiol., III, p. 546 (1842). The author of the article specifically states that the arrangement of the Myriapoda there proposed was the work of Gray, published from his manuscripts and with his consent. Hence there is no apparent reason for citing the authority of Jones as Latzel and others have done.

[5] Rev. et. mag. d. Zool. 2d series, XXI, p. 153 (1869).
Mission Scient. au Mexique, Zool. VI, 2, p. 56 (1872).

Let us hope that before the nomenclatorial agitation entirely subsides, we may have a rule limiting scientific names to reasonable length. Their authors might then have the time and strength to make a serviceable description, possibly a plate! If this suggestion is not received favorably by the "cloth" it will be quite easy to secure enough "lay" votes to pass it by large majority. —O. F. Cook.

On the Generic Names Strigamia, Linotænia and Scolioplanes.—The genus *Strigamia*, was proposed by Gray, in 1842, in the article by T. Rymer Jones, in Todd's Cyclopædia, as cited in the preceding note. The description is as follows:

"Gen. H. Strigamia (*Geophilus*). Eyes none, antennæ 14-jointed, moniliform, rather elongate. Body linear, depressed. Feet, fifty pairs or more."

It is significant that *Strigamia* stands as the fourth genus of the Scolopendridæ, the other three being Lithobius, Scolopendra and Cryptops. The most natural inference from the above quotation is that Gray for some reason preferred *Strigamia* to Geophilus. This seems to have been Latzel's idea, for he places *Strigamia* Gray, as a doubtful synonym under Geophilus. Whatever may have been the intention of Gray, however, there would seem to be an insurmountable obstacle to the use of his name, in the fact that he published no species under it, the case not being parallel with that of Fontaria. Neither is there any mention of a species of *Strigamia* in what purport to be complete lists of the Chilopoda of the British Museum. Indeed, in the list of 1856, in the preparation of which Gray himself assisted, *Strigamia* appears only as a synonym of Geophilus! It should have rested quietly there, but names were too scarce, and so *Strigamia* was again brought out by Wood, in 1865, and applied to *Geophilus* Newport, not Leach. The type of Geophilus Leach, is *carpophagus*, but this species had been sequestrated by Newport and put into a new genus, *Arthronomalus*, leaving *Geophilus* as the name of another genus whose type was *acuminatus*, Leach. Thus Wood's proposition was to assign to *Strigamia* a type species *acuminatus*, and Latzel is in error in citing *Strigamia* Wood, as a synonym of Geophilus. If we allow that aborted names and synonyms can be thus resuscitated, *Strigamia* Wood, must have stood as a valid genus had it not been for the fact that C. L. Koch had in 1847 established the genus Linotænia on *Geophilus crassipes.* C. L. Koch, a congener of *acuminatus*, so that *Strigamia* Wood is a synonym of Linotænia C. L. Koch.

Neglecting the claims of Linotænia, Bergsoe and Meinert, in 1866, described *Scolioplanes* on *Geophilus maritimus* Leach, also congeneric with *acuminatus* and *crassipes.* The only ground on which *Scolioplanes* could be considered valid is that Linotænia as described by Koch was not a natural group, but this criticism would destroy a large majority of the older genera. It may be that the establishment of *Scolioplanes* was wise at the time, for the identities and relationships of even the European Geophilidæ were uncertain. At present, however, the European authors seem to be agreed that *acuminatus*, *crassipes* and *maritimus* are members of one genus, and while this view is held it would seem that the genus must stand as Linotænia C. L. Koch, with *Scolioplanes* Bergsoe, and Meinert as synonym.

Still another complication has been introduced by Sseliwanoff.[6] He uses *Scolioplanes* Bergsoe and Meinert, but recognizes *Strigamia* Gray as distinct, describing it at length and giving figures of *Strigamia parviceps* Wood, from California, also placing *Strigamia* Wood as a synonym of *Strigamia* Gray. To judge by the descriptions and diagrams of Meinert, Latzel and Daday, the European species as represented by *crassipes* are to be distinguished from *parviceps* by apparently good generic characters. That the American forms which have been referred to *Strigamia*, *Scolioplanes* and *Linotænia* are all congeneric is improbable, but Sseliwanoff has assumed the responsibility of separating *parviceps* and its allies from Linotænia (*Scolioplanes*), and his distinctions should not be ignored, even if *Strigamia* is no longer available as a generic name.

Dissections of *Strigamia bothriopus* Wood, *S. chionophila* Wood, and *S. parviceps* Wood, show that the mouth-parts of all three are very much alike, and that they differ from Linotænia in having the labial sternum divided, and the labial palpus two-jointed, the basal joint with a process, as in Sseliwanoff's figure of *parviceps.* Hence it seems probable that the other American species are more likely to be related to a genus founded on *parviceps* than to the European genus Linotænia.

---

[6] Geophilidæ museja imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk, p. 12 (1881). T. I., figs. 1–8.

It is proposed, then, to end, if possible, the confusion which has long attended the use of these generic names by the following arrangement of synonomy:

Genus Geophilus Leach (1814), type *carpophagus* Leach.
Syn. *Strigamia* Gray (1842), no type.
Syn. *Arthronomalus* Newp. (1844), type *longicornis* (Leach).
Genus Linotænia C. L. Koch (1847), type *crassipes* (C. L. Koch).
Syn. *Strigamia* Wood (1865), type *acuminatus* (Leach).
Syn. *Scolioplanes* B. & M. (1866), type *maritimus* (Leach).
Genus Tomotænia nom. nov.
Syn. *Strigamia* Ssel. (1881), type *parviceps* (Wood).

The genus Linotænia is distributed over Europe and Northern Asia. The species are: *acuminatus* (Leach), *crassipes* C. L. Koch, *maritimus* (Leach), *pusillus* Ssel., *sacolinensis* (Meinert), *sibiricus* (Ssel.), *sulcatus* Ssle.

The genus Tomotænia, including species which must be provisionally referred to it, is distributed over temperate North America. The genera of Chilopoda, however, do not appear to be confined by continents, so that a further modification of generic lines and distribution is to be expected. The species which, pending further investigation, should be referred to Tomotænia are: *bidens* (Wood), *bothriopus* (Wood), *branneri* (Bollman), *chionophila* (Wood), *exsul* (Meinert), *fulva* (Sager), *lævipes* (Wood), *longicornis* (Meinert), *maculaticeps* (Wood), *parviceps* (Wood), *robustus* (Meinert), *rubra* (Bollman), *walheri* Wood.

—O. F. Cook.

Picobia Villosa (Hancock).—A response to Mr. E. L. Trouessart. In the April number of The American Naturalist, p. 382–384, I described and figured "a new trombidian" under the above name. In a more recent issue of the same magazine, July, p. 682–684, Dr. E. L. Trouessart, of Paris, takes exception to the species claiming it to be a form of Cheyletinæ, already well known in Europe, not differing from *Syringophilus bipectinatus* Heller. This writer has contributed some valuable articles upon the Acarina with which I was perfectly conversant at the time, notwithstanding he says I was "not acquainted with the modern literature on this interesting type." Thinking it necessary to mention only those papers which bore a classical relation to the species described, these were omitted. In adopting the genus Picobia, I was not alone, for there are others who dissent from the classification Mr. Trouessart lays down, notable among these being Newman,[7] who maintains, that "the cheyletinæ, parasites of birds, comprise the genus Cheyletus, Harporhynchus, and Picobia; and in regard to Heller's genus, Syringophilus, the same writer says, p. 236, "for these Acarina he (A. Heller) created the genus Syringophilus which evidently enters into the genus Picobia, and he has described two species in it which ought to be named *Picobia bipectinata* and *P. uncinata.*" The various immature stages and the unsettled condition of this group of Acarina, together with an almost total absence of American literature has made it an unusually difficult field for students taking up this line of work. However this may be, we are thankful for the timely discussion, or I may say criticism, raised by Mr. Trouessart on my species, and the expression of his views upon a subject which he is conceded to be an eminent authority. If the form *Picobia villosa* from the black flycatcher is what he claims namely: The same as the European species above mentioned, we are pleased to have the matter straightened, also the point emphasized of the caution necessary in presenting as new, immature stages of these Acarina, sometimes so very different from the adult, and with shades of individual differences, even from localities as widely separated as Europe and America. —DR. J. L. HANCOCK.

---

[7] Treatise on Parasitic Diseases, p. 235, 1892.

Chicago.

EMBRYOLOGY.[1]

Conjugation in an American Crayfish.—The following observations upon the breeding habits of *Cambarus affinis* show how much difference there is between the American crayfish and the European form, Astacus, and serve to clear up some important structures of hitherto unknown use.

Some specimens brought from Washington, D. C., in November, 1894, immediately united in pairs when put into a shallow vessel of water. The same specimens and also others received in February paired during February, March and April. About a dozen cases were carefully observed with the following results:

In captivity the entire process of conjugation lasts from two to ten hours and may be repeated by either animal with some other.

---

[1] Edited by E. A. Andrews, Baltimore, Md., to whom abstracts, reviews and preliminary notes may be sent.